

made to raise a national subscription for a volunteer fleet.

**The Herald (Madrid)** declares that few Spaniards, except Senor de Lome, the Spanish Minister at Washington, believe that President Cleveland will not recognize the insurgents as belligerents. It adds that if the United States also means war with Spain the latter would prefer it to humiliation.

**Gil Blas (Paris).** In discussing the debates of Congress on Cuba, says that no change has arisen in the situation justifying a modification of the attitude of the American Executive hitherto observed with respect to Spain. Because the insurgents pillage villages, destroy plantations and even gain from time to time, partial successes over small detachments of Spanish troops, it is no reason for making them benefit by the recognition of belligerency and for admitting the possibility of foreign intervention. Cleveland and his Ministers have held this opinion hitherto, and it is doubtful whether explosions of Monism on the part of Congress will succeed in making them change this attitude.

**The Daily Chronicle (London):** The House of Representatives has at length, by a enormous majority, agreed with the Senate concerning Cuba, and therefore President Cleveland is free to face with the concurrent resolution of both houses expressing sympathy with the Cuban insurgents and the idea of Cuban independence. He is not compelled to take any action in consequence of this, but his dilemma in the matter is certainly a very embarrassing one. If he ignores the resolution he runs the risk of offending the public mind, if Congress really represents this, while on the other hand, if he takes any action in the spirit of the resolution, all sorts of complications in international law will arise in the relations between the United States, with both Europe and South America, and in military and naval matters. He has successfully navigated both political rapids before now, but this is perhaps the most dangerous of all, and Spain in the meantime is adding largely to her forces in Cuba. Four freecorps and 40,000 men are ready to start.

**El Liberal (Madrid)** considers the situation serious and adds that if belligerency be declared war will surely follow.

**La Epoca (Madrid official organ)** publishes an article declaring if President Cleveland is now vacillating he will vacillate more in some months' time, when the progress of the Spanish revolution will be such that he will make the proclamation of belligerency still more difficult. No one thinks that Cleveland will declare belligerency, but if he does his action would be construed as a mere bluff, but as a proof that the United States are unflinchingly toward Spain, and this will be a source of conflicts which may bring about a complete rupture in course of time.

**ENGLAND'S SILENT AID.**  
She May Support Spain Diplomatically, But Not to the Extent of Engaging in War.

By Julius Chambers.  
Washington, April 6.—Administration and Democratic circles here are not surprised the statement that England would endeavor to assist Spain in maintaining session of Cuba. The moneyed States are unflinchingly toward Spain, and this will be a source of conflicts which may bring about a complete rupture in course of time.

By Julius Chambers.  
Washington, April 6.—Administration and Democratic circles here are not surprised the statement that England would endeavor to assist Spain in maintaining session of Cuba. The moneyed States are unflinchingly toward Spain, and this will be a source of conflicts which may bring about a complete rupture in course of time.

By Julius Chambers.  
Washington, April 6.—Administration and Democratic circles here are not surprised the statement that England would endeavor to assist Spain in maintaining session of Cuba. The moneyed States are unflinchingly toward Spain, and this will be a source of conflicts which may bring about a complete rupture in course of time.

By Julius Chambers.  
Washington, April 6.—Administration and Democratic circles here are not surprised the statement that England would endeavor to assist Spain in maintaining session of Cuba. The moneyed States are unflinchingly toward Spain, and this will be a source of conflicts which may bring about a complete rupture in course of time.

By Julius Chambers.  
Washington, April 6.—Administration and Democratic circles here are not surprised the statement that England would endeavor to assist Spain in maintaining session of Cuba. The moneyed States are unflinchingly toward Spain, and this will be a source of conflicts which may bring about a complete rupture in course of time.

By Julius Chambers.  
Washington, April 6.—Administration and Democratic circles here are not surprised the statement that England would endeavor to assist Spain in maintaining session of Cuba. The moneyed States are unflinchingly toward Spain, and this will be a source of conflicts which may bring about a complete rupture in course of time.

By Julius Chambers.  
Washington, April 6.—Administration and Democratic circles here are not surprised the statement that England would endeavor to assist Spain in maintaining session of Cuba. The moneyed States are unflinchingly toward Spain, and this will be a source of conflicts which may bring about a complete rupture in course of time.

## CARLISLE'S LETTER BETWEEN THE LINES.

His Friends Believe He Is Willing to Be a Candidate.

He Will Make No Personal Effort, However, to Secure the Nomination.

As Cleveland's Finance Minister He May Be Relied on to Lead the Fight Against Silver.

CHANCES ENDANGERED BY A VOWAL.

Kentucky Adherents Say Home Pride Would Settle All Existing Differences on the Money Question in That State.

By Julius Chambers.

Washington, April 6.—The letter of Secretary Carlisle means that he would gladly accept the Democratic nomination for President. That is the interpretation placed upon it by all the friends of the Secretary. The explanation given by Democrats who have conferred with Mr. Carlisle on this subject is that while he desires the nomination, he will not openly avow himself a candidate nor will he make any personal effort to get the nomination.

The reason given for the somewhat evasive letter of the Secretary is that he intends to exert every influence in his power to protect the adoption of a "sound money" plank in the Chicago platform. The President relies upon Mr. Carlisle, as the financial Minister of the Government, to lead and direct the fight now pending within the Democratic party for sound money principles and against silver. He is expected to employ all agencies at his command to repress the free silver element and to bring about the election of anti-silver Democrats to the National Convention.

Carlisle Looks Ahead.

As an avowed candidate for the nomination, Mr. Carlisle would be sorely handicapped in his work of conducting the Administration's financial battle in the various States and district conventions. He would subject himself to the severest criticism. He would run the risk of provoking a split in the party before the assembling of the National Convention. The pro-silver Democrats would naturally resent the interference of the Secretary of the Treasury with the selection of delegates in States wherein he has no claim of leadership. They will condemn and denounce the attempts of the Secretary to influence the choice of delegates any how; but, were he to declare himself a candidate for the nomination, his efforts in behalf of sound money would be doubly embarrassing.

The Secretary says, in effect, that, while he is not a candidate in the sense that he will make any effort to obtain the nomination, he leaves his claims to consideration in the hands of his friends. He frankly declares that he would be glad to be the endorsement of his State. The theory of his attitude is that this letter places him in a position to struggle for the domination of the Administration's financial principles in his party without subjecting him to the charge of being engaged in an effort to promote selfish ends.

At all events, without regard to the effect that his course may have upon his prospects, the Secretary is determined to wage an uncompromising battle for the approval of the Administration's position on finance at Chicago. No man in public or private life more thoroughly enjoys the confidence of Mr. Carlisle than Senator Lindsay, of Kentucky. That Senator says:

What His Friends Say.  
"I regard Secretary Carlisle's letter as a plea for the Presidential nomination. No, I do not think the Secretary wants to be returned to the Senate. I think he would much rather have the Presidential nomination."

Upon being asked if it would not be necessary for Mr. Carlisle to make peace with Senator Blackburn before he could expect a solid Kentucky delegation, Mr. Lindsay replied: "I will have to decline to further discuss the Kentucky situation."

Ex-Governor and Representative McGraw, of Kentucky, another close confidential friend and supporter of Secretary Carlisle, interprets the letter as follows: "The position of Mr. Carlisle is in accordance with the dignity of the office of Secretary of the Treasury. I understand his letter to mean that he will be pleased to have the commendation and endorsement of the Democrats of Kentucky, but that he is unwilling to participate in a contest for the nomination as the Democratic candidate for President, and he is more concerned about the declaration of the party's principles and particularly his position on the monetary system of our country and the character and amount of taxation, than the selection of candidates."

Thinking He Acts Wisely.  
"In seeking to avoid the contest of rival candidates and in leaving the delegates embarrassed as to who to vote for, the Secretary is acting wisely and is the latest of party success. The Democratic convention of Kentucky will, I think, by a large majority endorse Mr. Carlisle and instruct the delegates to the National Convention to vote for him as the Democratic candidate for President. If the National Convention adopts a platform, as I believe it will, in harmony with the views so often expressed by Mr. Carlisle, the Secretary's position will be a very strong one. There is reason for the belief that Mr. Carlisle will remain in Washington some time going over with the President and Secretary Olney all the matters affecting the relations of Turkey and the United States and giving them the benefit of his knowledge and observations."

SENATOR MORGAN IS ILL.

His Condition Gave Rise to Alarm, but Considerable Improvement Is Now Reported.

Washington, April 6.—Senator Morgan, of Alabama, has been confined to his bed for two or three days with a severe cold, and his condition yesterday greatly alarmed the family. He was suffering great pain in the right side, but was better this morning. Important. Salvation Oil, the greatest cure on earth for pain, is only 25 cents. \*.

is as near an announcement for the high office of President as any man can make. Senator Stewart, of Nevada, Populist, said Mr. Carlisle's letter demonstrates beyond all doubt that "Barkis is willin'." It is a plea to the money powers to put him in office.

**Kentucky Would Support Him.**  
Louisville, Ky., April 6.—Secretary Carlisle is regarded by local and State politicians as the logical candidate of the Democratic party. Postmaster Weaver says State pride will go a long way toward settling the differences on the money question in Kentucky, and predicts that Carlisle can be elected on a sound money platform.

Charles R. Long says: "I have talked to-day with many politicians. They, one and all, pronounce Carlisle the logical candidate of the party and will give to him their hearty support. I have failed to find a Democrat who is not favorable to his candidacy."

Colonel John S. Whallen says Blackbarn men would rally to the Carlisle standard on account of State pride, and because he represents true Democracy.

The Evening Post to-day prints replies from nearly all the county chairmen in the State. The free silver chairmen all oppose Carlisle's candidacy, but none raises a hand against him, the worst that is said, coming from the rabid free silver sections, being that the carrying of Kentucky for sound money would be doubtful. A vast majority is unanimously for Carlisle, and all recognize in him the sound money leader.

CARLISLE IS NOT INVITED.

Chicago Labor Congress Repudiates the Request to Him to Speak.

Chicago, Ill., April 6.—At a meeting of the Labor Congress yesterday the following resolution was adopted: "Whereas, it has been reported through the public press that John G. Carlisle has been invited to this city to instruct the workmen on questions of finance; and whereas, no one has been named named in the letter of invitation has authorized any one to issue an invitation in the name of the Chicago platform. The President relies upon Mr. Carlisle, as the financial Minister of the Government, to lead and direct the fight now pending within the Democratic party for sound money principles and against silver. He is expected to employ all agencies at his command to repress the free silver element and to bring about the election of anti-silver Democrats to the National Convention."

Resolved, That John G. Carlisle, Secretary of the Treasury, be notified by the officers of the Chicago Labor Congress at the invitation extended to him does not constitute an endorsement of his candidacy, but has been sent to him by a number of self-appointed representatives, presumably working for individual interests.

SPANIARDS AGAIN ROUTED.

Government Troops Lay Their Defeat to Explosive Bullets Used by the Insurgents.

Havana, April 6.—Intelligence reaches this city of a fight that occurred among the hills around San Blas, near Cienfuegos, Province of Santa Clara, between the column commanded by Colonel Vasquez and a body of insurgents. The latter occupied an elevated position, which gave them a decided advantage over the Spaniards, who were taken by surprise.

The troops claim that the rebels used explosive bullets. However this may be, it is known that the Spaniards were defeated after a hot fight, losing many killed and wounded. Among the latter were Colonel Vasquez and Lieutenant Barba. At one time during the engagement the insurgents charged upon the troops with machetes, inflicting heavy losses.

An official account of the fight says that the insurgents lost twenty-one killed and three wounded, while the Spanish loss was sixteen wounded. The report says that the insurgents were defeated, but like many other of the reports issued by the Government, it is utterly unreliable. The insurgents, as stated above, completely surprised the troops and utterly routed them.

The newspapers here report that Gomez, with 4,000 men, is going to the Sagurao Valley.

A court martial held at Matanzas has sentenced four prisoners of war to death. They are Timoteo Mesa, Jose Gonzalez, Ramon Gonzalez and Sabastian Fresneda.

Twenty-four prisoners were to-day deported to the convict station on the Isle of Pines. Ten of them were convicted of political offenses, while the others were ordinary criminals.

NEW YORK'S CLAIM ALLOWED.

Court of Claims Gives Judgment for \$144,114 for War Money Advanced.

Washington, April 6.—The Court of Claims today rendered judgment for \$144,114 in favor of the State of New York for advances made to the United States during the war. The case was decided June 8, 1891, the court allowing \$92,820.84 on a claim made for \$131,185.02. The United States, as well as the State of New York, appealed to the Supreme Court on January 6, 1896. The Supreme Court held that the State was entitled to the amount allowed by the Court of Claims and to the additional sum of \$53,293.18, which had been disallowed by that court. While the Supreme Court agreed with the lower court as to the \$92,820.84, it reversed the judgment, and by this reversal the State was deprived of interest on the original judgment, amounting to \$12,226.69.

Senator Hill was the counsel for the State of New York in the case.

TERRELL IN GRATIFIED MOOD.

The Minister to Turkey Has a Satisfactory Interview with Mr. Olney.

Washington, April 6.—Alexander W. Terrell, United States Minister to Turkey, made an early call this morning on Secretary Olney, with whom he was closeted for some time. Mr. Terrell said that, despite the attacks made on his administration as Minister, he knew to his gratification that he was sustained by the President and the State Department. He could give no information as to the length of his stay in America. There is reason for the belief that Mr. Terrell will remain in Washington some time going over with the President and Secretary Olney all the matters affecting the relations of Turkey and the United States and giving them the benefit of his knowledge and observations.

SENATOR MORGAN IS ILL.

His Condition Gave Rise to Alarm, but Considerable Improvement Is Now Reported.

Washington, April 6.—Senator Morgan, of Alabama, has been confined to his bed for two or three days with a severe cold, and his condition yesterday greatly alarmed the family. He was suffering great pain in the right side, but was better this morning. Important. Salvation Oil, the greatest cure on earth for pain, is only 25 cents. \*.

## WORK FOR POLICE WAS DOUBLY HARD.

Raines Law Enforcement Caused Fifty Per Cent Increase in Sunday Arrests.

Forty-five Violators of the New Law Were Apprehended and Taken Before Magistrates.

PRISONERS HELD IN HEAVY BONDS.

Significant Remarks of Recorder Goff to the New Grand Jury—The Opinion of Assistant District Attorney Unger Is Pertinent.

The number of excise arrests in this city was increased last Sunday by 50 per cent over those of the Sunday before. On March 23 there were only thirty arrests. On April 3 forty-five were recorded. The Raines law was not so well observed as had been expected.

The first charge to a Grand Jury since the passage of the Raines bill was made by Recorder Goff yesterday in the Court of General Sessions. The foreman of the Grand Jury was Charles Stewart Smith, of the Chamber of Commerce, who was chairman of the Committee of Seventy which insisted on the nomination of Recorder Goff, nearly two years ago.

REMARKS OF RECORDER GOFF.  
The Recorder did not mention the Raines bill by name, but there was no mistaking what he had in mind. After cautioning them that the Grand Jury room was not a place to air hobbies, he said:

"I call your attention to a matter which engaged my attention, reported in the public newspapers, to the effect that a certain clergyman, not a member of the church, was a law recently passed by this State prohibited the use of wine in the administration of the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament, but to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament of communion in the various Christian churches. Such construction, gentlemen, can only be designated as extremely absurd. It was not the intention of the law to prohibit the use of wine in the sacrament,